

must be, *displaceably* mounted relative to the carrier, rather than non-displaceably mounted.

The aforementioned language at column 14, lines 1-5, states that the patient is positioned on the top board 25, and the top board 25, on which the patient is fixed, is *driven* in one of the directions of the double-headed arrow A in Figure 8, and is *inserted in* the gantry 10. This language makes absolutely clear that the patient table, with the patient thereon, is displaced into the gantry. This is exactly the opposite of the subject matter disclosed and claimed in the present application, wherein the support plate is explicitly stated to be non-displaceably mounted cantilevered to the carrier, and a mechanism is provided for moving the gantry independently of the support plate. Moreover, the aforementioned movement of the gantry is explicitly stated in claim 1 to include movement of *the gantry* into a use position wherein the support plate extends through the measuring opening. This makes clear that it is the gantry that is being moved to cause the patient to come to lie within the measuring opening of the gantry rather than movement of the patient on the support table.

The Fujita et al. reference, therefore, does not disclose all of the elements of independent claim 1 as arranged and operating in that claim, and therefore the Fujita et al. reference does not anticipate claim 1, nor does the Fujita et al. reference anticipate any of claims 2, 4 and 5 depending from claim 1.

As to claims 6 and 7, those claims also depend from claim 1 and thus embody all of the subject matter of claim 1 therein. Therefore, in claims 6 and 7, as in independent claim 1, the support plate which is adapted to receive the examination subject must be mounted in a cantilevered manner to the carrier. As can clearly be

seen in the Gordon reference, instead of a cantilevered mounting arrangement for the patient table 12, a four post mounting arrangement is specifically provided by means of vertical support members or legs 18 which are connected to the floor bracket 19, as described at column 3, lines 1-6 of the Gordon reference. The gantry, which is a part of the tomography means 14 in the Gordon reference, slides on rails which are fixed to the floor bracket, between the four legs 18 on which the table 12 is mounted.

In view of the explicit teachings noted above in the Fujita et al. reference that the patient table is displaced into the gantry, there is no teaching, inducement or motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Fujita et al. structure in accordance with the teachings of Gordon, wherein the tomography means 14 is displaceable. The subject matter of claims 6 and 7, therefore, would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,

Steven H. Noll (Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN & WAITE

**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312/258-5790  
Attorneys for Applicant.

CHI\_DOCS2\ 625952 1